

SECRET

Subject: Dr Levytsky, Wolodymyr of New York, N.Y.;  
Re: "Reaction" of the Soviet Ukrainian Mission to the Arrest  
of Archbishop Velychkiivsky Vasil

Source :

Date : 14 Mar 1969

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
SOURCES METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B  
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT  
DATE 2007

1. Subject came for lunch to Source's house on 12 Mar 1969 and stayed for about 3½ hours. According to Source his mission evidently was to "calm down" and "smooth out" the relationship between Source and the Soviet Ukrainian Mission which resulted from the arrest of Archbishop Velychkiivsky.

On 6 Mar 1969 Subject phoned Source and invited himself for a talk next Tuesday or Wednesday. On 7 Mar he phoned again and asked her whether she would come to the cocktail party given by the Mission for the Dynamo team and their guests. Source replied that she won't, "for obvious reasons". Velychkiivsky was her friend, she knew him from her youth in Ukraine; and in general, the latest step of the Sovs, she deemed to be outrageous, criminal also. Subject tried to calm her down and suggested that even in view of the latest event, she should not break all the contacts with the Mission because burning the bridges would be wrong and detrimental to the cause Source was representing. Anyway, he will come and explain everything. In his view Source should go the party on 10 March at the Mission and eventually "refuse to drink" but on the other hand this was a rather bad diplomacy.

On this occasion Subject also mentioned that DATSKO Yuri, editor of Nove Zhyttia of Priashiv (Presov) was here and it would be a good idea to arrange a meeting for him. Source directed him to the Round Table Club but Subject did not think this was a good idea. Anyway, DATSKO who was being taken care now by Levytsky was going to Pittsburgh and will return first mid-April to New York. Source suggested also REVAY as an eventual contact for DATSKO but Subject did not seem to be delighted with the idea. He mentioned also that another man from PRESOV by the name SHLEPETSKY (Josef) was already for a longer period in Washington, D.C. Subject implied that both are "good Ukrainians" though "perhaps with some Rusynsky inclinations".

On 12 Mar Subject phoned Source in the morning to ascertain that her invitation was still actual and arrived on time for lunch. Following is the gist of his assertions.

2. Subject stressed all the time the necessity for Source and her colleagues to maintain further contacts with the Mission and develop "cultural exchange" with Kiev. Of course, one has to be careful with whom Source was affiliating herself because some people and organizations are not suitable for cultural contacts for the reasons of their political and other activities.

On this occasion Subject attacked UHV Rivtsi, in particular Prolog, and Melnukivtsi for their connections with ~~xxxxxx~~ Western intelligence services and the way they publish Zakhalavni materials.

According to Subject all the zakhalavni materials are getting through

SECRET  
See 40 April 1969

SECRET

espionage channels , primarily through Polish KULTURA in Paris. .  
Actually, Subject is not against publications of Dziuba and Chornovil but rather against the commentaries , introductions, and interpretations added by emigres and their Western friends like Barghorn and Brzezinski. The slant given thus by those people to the zakhalavni materials and their improper anti-Soviet use do not serve the proper purpose and harm both, people in the Ukraine and Ukrainian cause abroad. On this occasion Subject emphasized that he wondered whether such an involvement of people like Brzezinski was helpful to ~~them~~ either. On the contrary, in his view, this was the surest way for scholars like him to be soon finished off. Actually, Brzezinski was already on his way "down-hill".

Cultural contacts with Kiev were essential for further stimulation of Ukrainization in the Ukraine. Subject gave one example which showed how great the ramifications of those contacts are. When Metropolitan FILARET visited recently New York he also spoke with the editor of the Ukrainian American SENUK. The latter asked Filaret what they publish in Kiev. The reply was , "Parish News". In what language? The answer , "in Russian". "How come in Russian , why not in Ukrainian," asked SENUK. Filaret, "Are you a Ukrainian nationalist?". SENUK: "what are you saying, you know pretty well who I am". "Sorry.. " In Subject's opinion this dialogue will definitely have proper "results" in Kiev .

Subject dwelt for a long time on his impressions from the Ukraine, he was convinced that things are getting better despite the Russification drive , and his main hope was on youth. In Subject's opinion, Ukrainian young people are in the avantgarde of Ukrainian revival and this process cannot be stopped. In his talks with his friends in the Ukraine Subject ascertained that this process was indeed very strong, and it was evidently manifested in reaction to the arrests of Ukrainian intellectuals in 1965/66. Even people on high echelons in the party and government were against those arrests. To strengthen this development it is necessary to develop cultural exchange despite everything, including the arrest of Velychkivsky.

Here again Subject attacked UHVR and their publications. In Subject's view the Prolog made a good start in 1961-63 by publishing more or less "fresh ideas". But later on it became obvious that this was not genuine but a camouflage for subversive purposes. Certainly, with such people no one would advice to maintain contact.

3. On this occasion Subject also mentioned that there are also some good news from Kiev, for instance, LEVISHCHENKO, Mykhailo against whom everybody had been complaining abroad, was removed from his post in the Society for cultural contacts and replaced with a IVANYTSKY (?). \*

4. On the matter of the arrest of Velychkivsky; this was not Kiev's responsibility . The arrest itself was engineered by "your own people on the spot and otherwise". Kiev and Lvov were against the arrest and only ~~followed~~ followed Moscow's orders. Incidentally, Subject knows positively that both, here in the Mission and in Kiev people are very unhappy about this sad event. But again it was not only Moscow's responsibility but the Vatican's and their friends' as well.

*Mykhailo Naumovych, deputy chairman of Society of History*  
*at Kiev U.S.S.R.*

No doubt, there <sup>is</sup> a collusion of sorts between the Pope and Moscow. The Velichkivsky's arrest has to be brought into wider picture of the present negotiations going on between the Vatican and Moscow. Moscow demands that Ukrainian Uniate Church should be completely liquidated also in the formal sense, and the Catholic church in general, in organizational structure had to be related to existing national states. There should be one catholic church in organizational sense and the Vatican agrees with that. Accordingly, the matters had been already solved, for instance, in Slovakia and Czechia. There will be only one catholic church in Slovakia headed by Hirka, Jan. Subject can understand why Moscow is against Ukrainian Uniate Church. But he also understands how important it was for Ukrainian potential in the past. Now, it's practically non-existent and its revival would not be in Moscow's interest. Subject wants to be objective and he understands the Vatican which also considers the Ukrainian Uniate Church as an obstacle to his agreement with Moscow. The Pope knows pretty well that Moscow ~~will~~ agree to establishment of a Roman-catholic church in the Soviet Union but not to that of a Ukrainian Catholic Church. Hence, he is very unhappy about Card. Slipyy and the "underground church" in the Ukraine. The arrest of Velichkivsky was definitely in the Vatican's interest and hence the "collusion". And no wonder the Pope did not protest against the arrest. In view of all that Subject does not envy SLIPYY'S situation. But it would be wrong if SLIPYY would decide to make some improper steps, in particular if he would make some anti-Soviet moves. He has to bite his time. Here Subject stressed again that people in Kiev and in the Mission are not happy about the arrest and were against it. But no one asked them. It was all done on Moscow's order, and certainly Subject cannot justify it.

Incidentally, Subject wanted to know whether there are any chances that SLIPYY would return to the Soviet Union. "Who knows maybe in the final result he would represent the new Catholic church?" But he doubted.

Anyway, it was Subject's strong opinion, that SLIPYY by no means should do now anything anti-Soviet but wait and see. On this occasion Subject mentioned that Cardinal had already made some improper moves like getting more and more involved with Ukrainian nationalists abroad. Thus, he agreed to his patronage over the Ukrainian National Soyuz' jubilee and went to the grave of Stetsko's mother. "This all was not necessary". The Cardinal should know better and Subject was sure that he still had a great respect in Kiev.

In short Source should continue with her contacts with the Mission, and SLIPYY should do nothing that would completely "compromise" him in Kiev's eyes.